

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2004/05/12 : CIA-RDP85T00788R000100060003-5

INTERNAL
USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

25X	FROM: <input type="text"/>	EXTENSION	NO.
	Acting Chief, Policy & Plans Group 4E-70, Hdqs.	<input type="text"/>	DATE 4 March 1980
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)		DATE	OFFICER'S INITIALS
		RECEIVED	FORWARDED
1.	DD/PTOS <input type="text"/>	14 MAR 80	C
2.	DD/PSI 4E-58, Hdqs.	11 MAR 80	C
3.	C/SSC <input type="text"/>	12 MAR 80	
4.	C/SEG 4E-21, Hdqs.	10 MAR 1978	C
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

Comments (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

Attached is latest edition of draft APEX Manual. Please review and provide any comments to PPG not later than 10 March 1980.

Bob M. ADVISED SSC will be commenting directly to MDC Steering Group.



SECRET



CONFIDENTIAL

INTERNAL
USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED

Date

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	


REMARKS

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
 Prescribed by GSA
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

 subbed
the attached. The
package is not complete
in that Charlie has not
had a chance to ~~prepare~~ prepare
his own comments. He will
do so ASAP.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

APEX Industrial Security Manual Draft-28 Feb 80

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

25X1

C/PSD/PTOS

DATE 11 March 1980

25X

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1.

DD/PTOS

11 MAR 1980

P

Attached are the PSD comments on the latest edition of the draft APEX industrial manual. This was originally dead-lined for yesterday, but as you know we got an extension from PPG until cob today.

2.

REC'D 14 MAR 80

3.

CM

In general, the comments are minor. One question I would suggest is the overall classification of the manual, which we feel should be unclassified. Except for the two question-marked paragraphs, all others are marked "unclassified." We see no reason to classify the manual at all.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

APEX INDUSTRIAL SECURITY MANUAL DRAFT

28 February 1980

PHYSICAL SECURITY DIVISION COMMENTS

The following comments are keyed by page and paragraph number to the 28 February 1980 DRAFT text:

Page 1, Paragraph 5

Concern was expressed as to how the government would assure that the implementing guidance is uniform from one official or agency to another. It was felt that any such guidance should be reviewed by the APEX Steering Group before it is published for implementation. ✓

Page 2, Paragraph 8

This paragraph requires annual inspections of Contractor APEX Control Facilities. Manpower limitations may make this an unrealistic expectation. ✓

Page 3, Paragraph 12

The annual revalidation of access approvals required by this paragraph is a good idea, but will require extensive contractor input, the cost of which will be passed on by the contractor to the government. ✓

Page 5, Paragraph 17 E

The two-year reindoctrination interval mentioned here is at variance with current Agency guidelines, which specify annual rebriefings. We believe that annual rebriefing of our industrial contractors is a valid and desirable concept. X

Page 6, Paragraph 18

It would appear from the content of this paragraph that need-to-know approval rests solely with the responsible Senior Intelligence Officer. Based on our experience, Program Managers and Office Directors are in a better position to know who really needs to know. We would suggest that the need-to-know authority be delegated to that level.

CONTRACTOR TO
BISM WHICH
SAYS REBRIEF - 1YR

REINDOC CAN
TAKE PLACE PERIODICALLY
NOT TO EXCEED 24 M
LOOKS OK -
FINE ADVISOR

X
IT IS
DELEGATED
BY THE SIO
AN APPROPRIATE
LEVEL

Page 11, Paragraph 39

The use of the work "generally" in line nine of this paragraph could lead one to speculate about the exceptions. If there are exceptions, we again have a situation where it would be difficult to tell just who would know how much about any given activity. ✓

Page 12, Paragraph 43

We would suggest use here of wording similar to that seen on page 14, paragraph 48, which would permit reinspections to be scheduled at the discretion of the Senior Intelligence Officer. Such an approach would seem more in line with manpower and budgetary limitations. [As a separate issue related to this paragraph (paragraph 43) we would propose that the currently enforced document inventory percentages be the ones used " . . . to ensure that accountability and control are being maintained."]

X
LANGUAGE IN
MANUAL PROVIDES
ADEQUATE LIMITS
NO NECESSITY FOR
TO'S

Page 17, Paragraph 59D

If interior pages of APEX documents bear no control number, how are they to be controlled if they should ever become separated from the basic document? How, for example, would lost portions of documents, once found, be traced back to the original? How would a contractor employee, displaying a document on a cathode ray tube (CRT) in order to make a hard copy of it, know what number to use to apply a control to the new document? Would he or she have to page all the way back to the first page to find the control, copy, and series numbers? What real control does the APEX Control System have if most of the materials in it are to bear no control numbers? ✓

Page 19, Paragraph 63

We would suggest that the word "should" in line eight be replaced with the word "will." ✓

Page 21, Paragraph 77

The question mark at the end of this paragraph caused us concern. Was it used because there is some question about the classification of the content of the paragraph? It would appear that the paragraph's content is UNCLASSIFIED. ✓

Page 23, Paragraph 87

The same comment applies as that immediately preceding. ✓

Page 25, Paragraph 95

An APEX Security Officer (ASO) works for the government. A contractor APEX Security Officer (CASO) works for the contractor. In order to be consistent with current procedures, and to result in cost savings to the government, we would suggest that both the ASO and the CASO, as appropriate, be authorized to indoctrinate approved personnel concerning the APEX Special Access Control System.